passengers from one place to another on a fixed hire. But the provisions of the Regulation were being enforced in utter disregard of the above principle, with the result that people were being put to severe hardship. The amount of money realised under the Regulation was also trifling. The continuance of the Regulation was characterised by the Member as a source of corruption and public scandal and he said that the proper working of the Regulation was impracticable. The boats plying for hire alone should be registered and only those boats which ought to be registered could be stopped or prosecuted. The first difficulty was to understand the meaning of the words "plying for hire". The Canal Officers thought that, if a boat-owner hired his boat to another for his private use, the boat was plying for hire and so they got a promise from the boat-owner before giving a free pass that he would not hire his boat to any one. But that view was wrong. Those boats were *not* plying for hire, but they were only *kept* for hire. The boats plying for hire were those boats transporting passengers from place to place, receiving from each a fixed fee, just as company boats and transit boats. If a person engaged a full boat for a fixed sum of money for his own use, for taking him or his family or his goods to another place, that boat was not plying for hire. It would thus be very difficult to find out whether a boat was fully hired by one person or whether it was transporting passengers by tickets. It was also difficult to find out whether the registered boats carried more passengers or goods than were allowed by the rules.

The intensity of public feeling against the Regulation was on the increase as was testified to by the several representations submitted to Government both in the Assembly and outside. The Member, therefore, earnestly requested Government to repeal the whole Regulation.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

37. Modification of the Land Conservancy Regulation

Mr. Ulahannan Ulahannan (Member, Minachil taluk) said that Regulation IV of 1091 worked real hardship to the land-holders of the State. The fines inflicted upon trespassers on *porambokes*, the prohibitory assessment levied on such lands and the rates of *tharavila* imposed before registry were all excessive.

According to the Settlement of 1012 M. E., there were no lands known as Sirkar *porambokes*. During the Survey operations carried on in 1079 in the Minachil taluk in connection with the last Settlement, the Survey subordinates had committed many irregularities in fixing the boundaries of registered holdings and the result was that portions of registered holdings were recorded as Sirkar *porambokes*.

Encroachments on *porambokes* were made penal by the Regulation. But the Revenue Officers who dealt with the question failed to enquire whether the encroachments were intentional or unlawful. The provision in section 9 of the Regulation that any building or other structure erected on a *poramboke* land by the trespasser was liable to forfeiture, if not removed by him after written notice, was also hard.

The Member then complained against the imposition of a *tharavila* of Rs. 25 per cent on *porambokes* in the taluk, and said that the rate was exorbitant. The rates of assessment of Re. 1 and Rs. 1½ per cent were prohibitive. He prayed that reasonable reductions be made in those rates.

The people had real grievances in regard to *poramboke* enquiries and they desired that, until satisfactory measures were devised by Government to obviate the evils, the enquiries might be held in abeyance.

The Member, therefore, suggested that the Land Conservancy Regulation, IV of 1091, be so amended as to ensure to registry-holders permanent rights to their property or that the power to dispose of *poramboke* cases be delegated to the Civil Courts.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly